

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 29-33, 35, 39, 43-47, 49 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Yanagawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,160).

Claims 34, 36-37, 40-42, 48, 50-52 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.*

Claims 29-56 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,451.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants herein submit a Terminal Disclaimer and a verified translation of the Korean Patent Application No. 1996/41779.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 29-56 are in condition for allowance.

The Rejection under Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Claims 29-56 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,451.

While Applicants traverse the rejection, Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer to facilitate allowance of the present application, thereby obviating the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 29-33, 35, 39, 43-47, 49 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Yanagawa et al.* Claims 34, 36-37, 40-42, 48, 50-52 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yanagawa et al.* These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The priority document of the present application, Korean Patent Application No. 1996/41779, was filed in Korean on September 23, 1996 and a verified translation thereof is submitted herewith. Since the filing date of the priority document is before the filing date of *Yanagawa et al.*, which was October 3, 1996, *Yanagawa et al.* should be excluded as prior art to the present application. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that *Yanagawa et al.* is disqualified as prior art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 29-56 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

With no other rejection pending, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29-56 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:



Mary Jane Boswell

Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: November 21, 2003

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001